

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
OCT 19 2006

USSN 10/762,119
Attorney Docket No.: 2000-0062-03

Remarks

Claims 1-4, 8-11 and 14-41 are pending this application. Claims 1, 2, 4, 8-11, 14, 16-23 and 30-41 are rejected and claims 3, 15, 24-29 are objected to. In response, claims 9 and 16 have been amended. Claims 14 and 15 have been cancelled. Claims 3, 15, and 24-29 are indicated as having allowable subject matter.

Claims 30-41 stand rejected under 35 USC §112 for reciting bandwidth stabilizer that is not disclosed in the specification. Applicants respectfully disagree. Starting with the last two sentences of page 7, a baffle system is described which reduces the perturbation caused by any acoustic energy returning to the discharge region. The result is that the net index of refraction gradients produced in the beam path is reduced. Applicants urge that one of ordinary skill would recognize this section of the application adequately describes the "bandwidth stabilizer" recited in claims 30-41.

Claims 9, 14-16, 19 and 20 stand rejected under 35 USC §112 for insufficient antecedent basis for some claim elements. The amendments to the claims correct these issues.

Thus reconsideration and withdrawal of rejection under 35 USC §112 of claims 9, 16, 19, 20 and 31-40 are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 8-11, 14 and 16-20 stand rejected under 35 USC §102 as being anticipated by admitted prior art.

Applicants urge that the admitted prior art (APA) does not identically disclose the features of claim 1. Specifically, the APA recognizes parallel chamber windows existed but that they produce an offset which complicates alignment of the optic components. Given that alignment of these optics is a critical aspect of large gas discharge laser systems, such systems used windows that were tilted opposite of one another. Accordingly, the APA teaches directly opposite to that of the recited gas discharge laser of the claims.

With respect to claim 4, the Examiner identifies power and wave meter 14 of FIG. 2 to be identical to the recited fast beam deflection monitoring means. Applicants point to the first full paragraph of page 3 that recognizes the feedback system of FIG. 2 has the problem that "gas pressure during operation produces a very slight change in wavelength that might be too fast for correction by normal feedback control." Thus, the recited fast beam deflection

USSN 10/762,119

Attorney Docket No.: 2000-0062-03

monitoring means and feedback control means are different than the conventional wave meter and controller of FIG. 2.

In view of the above remarks, Applicants urge that the APA does not identically disclose every feature in claims 1, 2, 4, 8-11, 14 and 16-20 and, therefore, does not provide the basis to support a rejection under 35 USC §102. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Claims 21-23 and 30-32 stand rejected under 35 USC §103 as unpatentable over APA in view of Knowles et al. (US 5,991,324). The Examiner asserts that APA discloses substantially all the claim features but admits that it does not disclose the bandwidth stabilizer. The Examiner contends that Knowles et al. discloses the stabilizer and concludes it would have been obvious to combine the two in order "reduce pulse quality distortion."

Applicants urge that for the same reasons described above, the APA does not disclose or suggest the features recited in claims 21-23 and 30-32. Because Knowles et al. fail to disclose or suggest these features as well, the combination does not disclose or suggest all the features recited in these claims and, therefore, does not provide the necessary basis to support a prima facie case of obviousness. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 USC §103 of these claims are requested.

Applicant authorizes the Commissioner to charge our Deposit Account No. 03-4060 \$450.00 for the two-month extension of time fee. Applicants do not believe that any additional fees are due in regard to the prosecution of this amendment, but in the event that any such fees are due the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge Cymer, Inc.'s Deposit Account No. 03-4060 for any such fees.

Respectfully submitted,


Wesley Strickland, Reg. No. 44,363

October 19, 2006
Cymer, Inc.
Legal Department - MS/4-2C
17075 Thornmint Court
San Diego, California 92127
Telephone: 858-385-7185